a be

JACK SCHWEIGERT, #1560 550 HALEKAUWILA STREET, Room 309 HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813 TELEPHONE NO. 533-7491

FILED IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MAYAN

ARTHUR E. ROSS. #1005 226 Queen Street, Suite 210 HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813 TELEPHONE NO. 52-4343 MAR 0 2 2006 3 at __o'clock and __min.__MW SUE BEITIA, CLERK

RORY SOARES TOOMEY, #2323 1088 BISHOP STREET, SUITE 1004 HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813 TELEPHONE NO. 533-7162

Attorneys for Plaintiff OFELIA COLOYAN

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

RICT OF HAWAII
) CIVIL NO. 03-00476-KSC
) NOTICE OF FILING PLAINTIFF'S PROPOSED JURY
) INSTRUCTIONS; CERTIFICATE
) OF SERVICE
)
)
Trial is set for March 14, 2006.

NOTICE OF FILING PLAINTIFF'S PROPOSED JURY _INSTRUCTIONS

Ofelia Coloyan Plaintiff above-named by and through his attorneys Jack

Schweigert, Esq., Arthur E. Ross, Esq., and Rory Soares Toomey, Esq. submits her proposed jury instructions which have not been agreed to by the parties.

The Plaintiff reserves her right to withdraw any proposed instruction, to add new instructions, and/or to amend any proposed instruction. By submitting these proposed instructions, the Plaintiff does not admit or concede that any particular issue is, or may be properly submitted to the jury, nor dose the Plaintiff does not admit or concede that any particular issue is a jury issue as opposed to a matter to be decided by the Court.

Nothing in these instructions constitutes consent by the Plaintiff to try any issue raised in the pleadings.

DATED: Honolulu, Hawaii, March 1, 2006

ARTHUR E. ROSS

RORY SOARES TOOMEY

Attorneys for Plaintiff OFELIA COLOYAN

On the Plaintiff's claim against the Defendants for the Defendants' violation of her Fourth Amendment rights for entering and searching her home, the Plaintiff has the burden of proving each of the following elements by a preponderance of the evidence:

- 1. The acts or omissions of the Defendants were intentional:
- 2. The Defendants acted under the color of state law; and
- 3. The acts or omissions of the Defendants were the legal cause of the deprivation of the Plaintiff's rights protected by the Constitution and/or laws of the United States.

If you find that each of the elements on which the Plaintiff has the burden of proof has been proved, your verdict should be for the Plaintiff. If, on the other hand, the Plaintiff has failed to prove any of these elements, your verdict should be for the Defendants.

CHE:	Section 11.1 Ninth Circuit Manual of Modern Jury Instruction (2001)
	(modified)
Give	n as Requested
Give	n as Modified
Refu	nsed
With	drawn
Over objec	etion of:
Plain	tiff
Defe	ndants

When a party has the burden of proof on any claim or affirmative defense by a preponderance of the evidence, it means you must be persuaded by the evidence that the claim or affirmative defense is more probably true than not true.

You should base your decision on all of the evidence, regardless of which party presented it.

CITE:	Section.1.3 and 5.1 Ninth Circuit Manual of Modern Jury Instruction
	(2001) (modified)
Give	en as Requested
Give	en as Modified
Ref	used
With	ndrawn
Over obje	ction of:
Plair	ntiff
Defe	endants

Filed 03/02/2006

Plaintiff's Proposed Jury Instruction 3

This action was brought by a private citizen against persons who are employed as police officer by the City and County of Honolulu, State of Hawaii. This case should be considered and decided by you as an action between persons of equal standing in the community, equal worth, and holding the same or similar station in life. All persons stand equal before the law, and are to be dealt with as equals in a court of justice.

Schwartz Section 1983 Litigation Section 3.03 as modified as adapted from Kerr
v. Chicago, 425 F. 2d 1134 (7th Cir.) Cert. denied 400 U. S. 833 (1970)
Given as Requested Given as Modified Refused Withdrawn
Over objection of: Plaintiff Defendants

An act is a cause of an injury or damage if it played any part, no matter how small, in bringing about the injury or damage. Therefore, even if the act operated in combination with some other cause, the act is a cause of the injury or damage if it played any part, no matter how small, in bringing about the injury or damage.

ruction

In order to be acting under color of state law the acts must be performed while the official is acting, purporting, or pretending to act in the performance of her official duty.

CITE: McDade v. West, 223 F. 3d 1135 (9th Cir. 2000), Section 11.2 Ninth
Circuit Manual of Modern Jury Instruction (2001) (modified) and Defendant
Nancy Murphy's Trial Brief, filed October 7, 2003, page 6.
Given as Requested Given as Modified Refused Withdrawn
Over objection of: Plaintiff Defendants

The Plaintiff claims that the Defendants intentionally deprived the Plaintiff of the Fourth Amendment constitutional right to be free from an unreasonable search.

The Plaintiff has the burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence that the Defendants' search of her home was unreasonable.

CITE: Section 115 Ninth Circuit Manual of Modern Jury Instruction (2001)

(modified)

Given as Requested

Given as Requested
Given as Modified
Refused
Withdrawn
Over objection of:
Plaintiff
Defendants

Filed 03/02/2006

Plaintiff's Proposed Jury Instruction No. 7

In order for a search pursuant to an arrest warrant to be reasonable, the police officer must have both reason to believe that the suspect resides at the premises to be searched and that he is in the place to be searched at the time.

	CITE:	<u>Perez v.</u>	Simmons,	884 F. 2	d 1136 (9°	' Cir. 1'	989).
	Given as Re	quested					
	Given as Mo	odified					
	Refused						
	Withdrawn						
Over	objection of	•					
	Plaintiff						
	Defendants						

If a police officer has a reasonable belief that the suspect resides in the premises to be searched but does not have a reasonable belief that the suspect is in the premises, or vice versa, the search is unlawful.

	CITE:	<u>Perez v.</u>	Simmons,	884 F.	2d 1136	(9 th Cir.	1989).
	Given as Rec	juested					
	Given as Mo	dified					
	Refused						
	Withdrawn						
Over	objection of:						
	Plaintiff						
	Defendants						

A police officer, who conducts a search of the home of a third party based solely upon an arrest warrant, must have probable cause to believe both that the suspect resides in the home and he is there at the time the arrest is to be made.

CITE:	<u>United States v. Gorman</u> , 314 F. 3d 1105, 1110-1115 (9 th Cir. 2002).
Given as R	equested
Given as M	odified
Refused	
Withdrawn	
Over objection o	f:
Plaintiff	
Defendants	

Therefore, a police officer may lawfully conduct a search of a third party's home for the subject of an arrest warrant only if the officers' knowledge has trustworthy information that would cause a person of reasonable caution to believe that the suspect 'is in (that) particular building, and at the same time that the search is conducted.

CITE: United States v. Gorman, 314 F. 3d 1105, 1113 (9th Cir. 2002).

citing Vasquez v. Snow 616 F. 2d 217, 220 (5th Cir. 1980)

quoting United States v. Phillips, 497 F. 2d 1131, 1136 (9th Cir. 1974).

Given as Requested

Given as Modified

Over objection of:
Plaintiff
Defendants

Refused

A search is reasonable, and a warrant is not required, if a person in lawful possession of the area knowingly and voluntarily consents to the search.

CITE: Section 117 Ninth Circuit Manual of Modern Jury Instruction	(2001)
modified)	
Given as Requested	
Given as Modified	
Refused	
Withdrawn	
Over objection of:	
Plaintiff	
Defendants	

Mere acquiescence to lawful authority is insufficient to constitute consent to a search.

CITE:	United States	s v. Spires,	3 F. 3d	111234,	1237 (9 ^{tl}	¹ Cir.	1993).
Given as R	equested						
Given as M	Iodified						
Refused							
Withdrawn	,						
Over objection o	f:						
Plaintiff							
Defendants	;						

If you find for the plaintiff on any of Plaintiff's Fourth Amendment claim, you must determine Plaintiff's damages. Plaintiff has the burden of proving damages by a preponderance of the evidence which will reasonably and fairly compensate the plaintiff for the deprivation of civil rights legally caused by the defendant.

In determining the amount of his damages, if any, you shall take into consideration the money that the plaintiff had to expend in medical treatment, prescription drugs, along with the loss of income that she suffered as a legal cause of the Defendants acts, as well as the amounts of money to compensate him for the outrage, mental suffering, shame, humiliation, and ridicule that he suffered.

Your award must be based upon evidence and not upon speculation guesswork or conjecture.

CITE:	Section 11.1 9 th Circuit Manual of Modern Jury Instruction (2001) (modified)
Giv	en as Requested
Giv	en as Modified
Ref	fused
- Wi	thdrawn
Over obje	ection of:
Plai	ntiff
Defe	endants

The law that applies to this case authorizes an award of nominal damages. If you find for the Plaintiff but that the Plaintiff has failed to prove damages as defined in these instructions, you must award nominal damages. Nominal Damages may not exceed one dollar.

CITE:	Section 11.6 9 th Circuit Manual of Modern Jury Instruction (2001)
Given	as Requested
Given	as Modified
Refus	ed
Witho	lrawn
Over objecti	on of:
Plainti	ff
Defend	lants

If you find for the plaintiff, you may, but are not required to, award punitive damages. The purposes of punitive damages are to punish a defendant and to deter a defendant and others from committing similar acts in the future.

The plaintiff has the burden of proving that punitive damages should be awarded, by a preponderance of the evidence. You may award punitive damages only if you find that defendant's conduct was malicious, or in reckless disregard of plaintiff's rights. Conduct is malicious if it is accompanied by ill will, or spite, or if it is for the purpose of injuring another. Conduct is in reckless disregard of plaintiff's rights if, under the circumstances, it reflects complete indifference to the safety and /or rights of others.

If you find that punitive damages are appropriate, you must use reason in setting the amount. Punitive damages, if any, should be in an amount sufficient to fulfill their purposes but should not reflect bias, prejudice or sympathy toward any party. In considering punitive damages, you may consider the degree of reprehensibility of the defendant's conduct and the relationship of any award of punitive damages to any actual harm inflicted on the plaintiff.

Section.7.5 9th Circuit Manual of Modern Jury Instruction (2001) CITE: (modified)

	Given as Requested
	Given as Modified
	Refused
	Withdrawn
	_
Over	objection of:
	Plaintiff
	Defendants

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DIS	IRICI OF HAWAII
OFELIA COLOYAN) CIVIL NO. 03-00476-KSC
Plaintiff,) CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE
VS.)
WILLIAM BADUA, JEFFERY OMAI; SPENCER ANDERSON; NEIL PANG; and DOES 5-10	
Defendants.)
	/

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on March 1, 2006, a copy of the attach

document was served upon:

KENDRA K. KAWAI 550 S. KING ST,. Rm 110 HONOLULU, HAWAII [X] HAND DELIVERED

[] UNITED STATES MAIL, first class Postage prepaid

Attorney for Defendants WILLIAM BADUA; SPENCER ANDERSON, NEIL PANG

DATED: Honolulu, Hawaii, March 1, 2006

JACK/SCHWEIGERT

RORY SOARES TOOMEY

Attorneys for Plaintiff OFELIA COLOYAN